

## **REMARKS**

In the non-final May 22, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-15. The Examiner also noted that claims 2, 3, 8, 11, 12, and 13 included allowable subject matter. By this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 9 to clarify Applicants' claimed invention. Applicant also cancels claims 2, 8, 14, and 15. No new matter is believed introduced by the clarifying amendments.

Regarding the Examiner's comments on allowable subject matter, Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's comments. Applicants do not concede or admit, however, that the Examiner's comments are accurate or apply to all of the allowed claims, nor that the stated reasons are the only reasons for allowability of the Claims. *See Salazar v. Procter & Gamble Co.*, 414 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

After entry of this Response, Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-13 are pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-13 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in light of the following remarks.

### **I. Pending Claims**

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Examiner states that the meaning of the term "vector" as used in the specification is unclear. The term vector is a term known to a person of ordinary skill in the art to generally be a one dimensional array. A logical chip select vector is an array of all logical chip select bits and a physical chip select vector is an array of all physical chip select bits (i.e. CS(0) : CS(7)). Accordingly, paragraph six has been amended to clarify the use of the term vector in the application.

Additionally, claim 6 has been amended to remove the requirement that the physical chip select vector be physically connected to the plurality of memory modules.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended and this rejection is now moot.

#### Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 5-7, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sandorfi (U.S. Patent No.6,836,818). Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to incorporate allowable subject matter from claims 2 and 8 respectively. Therefore the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is now moot.

#### Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4, 9, 10 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandorfi in view of Haas et. Al (U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0215906). Claims 4, 9, and 10 variously depend from claims 1 and 6, which have been amended to incorporate allowable subject matter from claims 2 and 8 respectively. Claim 15 has been cancelled. Therefore the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is now moot.

Applicants, therefore, believe that Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-13 are allowable and that their respective dependent claims are also allowable for the further limitations contained therein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all current rejections and issuance a Notice of Allowance in due course of patent office business.

## **II. Fees**

Applicants file this Response within three months of the May 22, 2006 Office Action and with no additional claims. Accordingly, Applicants believe that no extension or claims fees are due. The Commissioner is authorized, however, to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 20-1507.

## **III. Conclusion**

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the non-final Office Action mailed May 22, 2006. Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-13 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request passing of this case in due course of patent office business. If the Examiner believes there are other issues that can be resolved by a telephone interview, or there are any informalities remaining in the application which may be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, a telephone call to Jeff Waters at (404) 885-3082 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP

/jeffreylwaters53749/  
Jeffrey L. Waters  
USPTO Registration No. 53,749  
Attorney for INTEL CORPORATION

TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP  
Bank of America Plaza  
600 Peachtree Street, NE  
Suite 5200  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308-2216  
United States of America  
P: (404) 885-3082  
F: (404) 962-6828  
E: jeffrey.waters@troutmansanders.com  
**DATE: AUGUST 16, 2006**